DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 132 PS 020 892

AUTHOR Holmes, Tony
TITLE Toi Te Pupu, Toi Te Mana, Toi Te Whenua: Culturally Appropriate Early Childhood Education.
PUB DATE May 92
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the "Children at Risk" Conference (Bergen, Norway, May 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS American Indian Education; *Bilingual Education Programs; Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Background; *Cultural Education; *Early Childhood Education; Ethnocentrism; Foreign Countries; *Indigenous Populations; Minority Groups; *Multicultural Education; National Programs; Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS *Aboriginal People; Australia; Maori (People); Native Americans; *New Zealand; United States

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the issues of power, self-determination, and culturally appropriate learning as they relate to Australian Aboriginal, Native American, and Maori early childhood programs. It is asserted that many programs for the education of indigenous peoples in Australia, the United States, and New Zealand have failed to serve the needs and aspirations of those peoples, because the majority culture in those countries has historically maintained policies of assimilation of and hegemony over native peoples. Only in the last several decades have national and local governments and agencies come to address the inequities of early childhood programs within indigenous communities. The aims of culturally appropriate early childhood education for indigenous peoples include: (1) acknowledging the validity of cultural knowledge and ways of learning; (2) enhancing self-esteem, cultural pride, identity, and self-concept; (3) enhancing educational outcomes, including maintenance of the people's native language; (4) educating for self-determination; and (5) furthering bicultural and multicultural understanding. Real progress to meet the educational needs of indigenous peoples is possible by providing for the control of their educational resources by the indigenous peoples themselves. Contains 42 references. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

ED352132

TOI TE KUPU,
TOI TE MANA,
TOI TE WHENUA:

CULTURALLY APPROPRIATE EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Paper presented at the CHILDREN AT RISK Conference.
Norwegian Centre for Child Research,
Bergen, Norway.
May 1992.

Tony Holmes.
Lecturer in Early Childhood Education,
Te Kura o Nga Purapura o te Matauranga/
School of Early Childhood Education
Te Whanau o Ako Pai ki te Upoko o te Ika/Wellington College of Education,
Wellington,
AOTEAROA/NEW ZEALAND

PS 020892

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T.D. Holmes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Toi te Kupu, Toi te Mana, Toi te Whenua:
Culturally Appropriate Early Childhood Education.

1. Introduction.

2. The History of Indigenous Peoples.

3. Education and Indigenous Peoples.

4. Culturally Appropriate Early Childhood Education.

5. Native American Early Childhood education in the United States.

6. Australian Aboriginal Early Childhood Education.

7. Maori Early Childhood Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

8. Conclusion: Power, Self-determination and
   Culturally Appropriate Early Childhood Education Programs.

Toi te Kupu, Toi te Mana, Toi te Whenua: Cul'urally Appropriate Early Childhood Education[1]

Tony Holmes,
Lecturer in Early Childhood Education,
Te Kura o Nga Purapura o te Matauranga / School of Early Childhood Education
Te Whanau o Ako Pai ki te Upoko o te Ika/Wellington College of Education,
AOTEAROA / NEW ZEALAND

1.Introduction

Many programmes for the education of indigeneous peoples[2] have failed dismally to cater to their needs and aspirations. (NZ Waitangi Tribunal,1986, and the Australian Select Committee on Aboriginal Education, 1985). This is because the rights of indigenous children to grow up in an environment which nurtures them within their own culture and allows them access to their world through their own language have not been fully recognised or legally protected in many societies. Education programmes which have claimed to meet children's needs and the aspirations of their parents and to offer a pathway to adult self-determination have most often been good only in their intentions. Racism, classism and linguicism underlying the programmes have resulted in newer and more sophisticated modes of assimilation (Cummins, J and T Skuttnabb-Kangas, 1988).

In many societies Principles 2 and 7 of the UN Declaration of Children's Rights-those concerned with the protection, acknowledgement and validation of childhood, and the right to an education within the child's own culture are flouted wherever children's development is inhibited by teaching through a language and culture which is not native to them. Spiritual development is particularly denied.

Demands for the Aboriginalisation of education by indigenes in Australia, for American Indian self-determination, and Maori Tinorangatiratanga in Aotearoa/New Zealand continue to challenge the dominant cultural institutions and are forcing them and their agents to radically re-evaluate policies and programs.[3] Early childhood education is at the forefront of these changes, e.g. the phenomenal growth of Te Kohanga Reo / Maori Language Nests since 1982 in Aotearoa / New Zealand.

Many indigenous cultures have modes of learning based on holistic philosophies and have an ecological perspective which have been shown through experience to be compatible with those in some integrated early childhood programmes. This paper discusses the issues of power, self-determination, and culturally appropriate learning with reference to the author's experience of Australian Aboriginal, Native American, and Maori[4] early childhood programmes.

2.The History of Indigenous Peoples.

The existence of indigenous peoples is under threat in many parts of the world. Some from famine, some from warfare, some because their natural habitat is being progressively or accidentally destroyed, some through slave labour and others through unjust employment practices.

The idea of progress in advanced western societies provides such a powerful ideology that different world views stand little chance of remaining outside of the process of "development." Powerful nations overwhelm the smaller less powerful ones, politically, economically, and ideologically. New institutions and new social relations have been imposed. "Knowledge" and "reality" socially constructed within one culture have produced destructive effects on traditional social and cultural systems when imposed on other cultures.

Histories of exploration, invasion, dispossession, white settlement, colonisation, assimilation, and in some cases genocide, has been repeated in many places. This oppression continues today as denials of human rights, economic alienation (including slavery), ridicule, denigration, dependency (including paternalism), induced self-hatred, shame and spiritual alienation. Indigenous peoples are often without land or material resources, and without an identity, a culture, or a language of their own choosing. Their histories have been written by those either directly involved in, or supporters of, the colonising process. These predominantly racist histories have been questioned in more recent times by the peoples subjected to the process and by others who have sought justice through alternative truths.

Many governments never wanted to accommodate indigenous cultures. Continuing oppression has produced poverty and disadvantage today which affects relationships, life chances, health, educational opportunities, emotional security, and physical safety. In most places indigenous peoples generally have the lowest life expectancy at birth, highest infant mortality, poorest health, low rates of attendance in early childhood programmes, and at school, low educational achievement, high rates of unemployment and imprisonment, and widespread drug and alcohol abuse. A high proportion are living in sub-standard housing or temporary shelter. All these factors contribute to the breakdown of culture and traditions and create social dislocation. Many indigenous peoples live under third world conditions within so-called "advanced" societies. This is the case for significant numbers of indigenes in New Zealand, Australia and the US. It was expected that these people would die out, but when they didn't, assimilation was seen as one convenient solution.

In spite of this oppression, indigenous peoples have survived and preserved in their own way a world-view distinct from the majority culture. Some are experiencing a renaissance, a new birth. Many indigenous peoples are challenging the so-called "progress" associated with "advanced" western scientific and technocratic society. Their holistic cosmology finds support in the green ecological movement in resisting western capitalism. Land disputes, including mining and deforestation are the most obvious sites of struggle. Fisheries are another.[5] Another struggle is to preserve, maintain and enhance their indigenous culture and language. The site of struggle for this is the education system.

3. Education and Indigenous Peoples.

Schools and early childhood centres are neither neutral nor value free. Their structures and practices are designed to produce or reproduce a particular form of society. In countries where indigenous people are in the minority, institutions and the agents of the dominant culture struggle to maintain hegemonic control. Many indigenous peoples have come to believe the myths about themselves articulated by the dominant group. For example, that children's educational opportunities will be improved through "transitional" language programmes. This claim has been shown to be unfounded. This model uses the indigenous culture and exploits the native langauge as a bridge to more efficient and complete assimilation to the dominant language and school culture.

Critical reflection and rejection of this pervasive ethnocentricity allows indigenous peoples to define their aims for a culturally appropriate education for their children. The following aims are common to many:

To acknowledge the validity of cultural knowledge and ways of learning.
To enhance self-esteem, cultural pride, identity and self-concept.
To enhance educational outcomes-including maintaining the language.
To meet community needs, parents needs, children's needs.
To educate for self-determination.
To further bicultural and multicultural understanding
and not just
to compensate for disadvantage, or
as a preparation for school, or
to improve attendance, or
to be transitional to the language of the dominant group(assimilative).

The beneficial outcomes of extended teaching through the child's native language have been documented (Cummins, J. 1982). The longer a child is exposed to, and taught in his/her first language, the greater are his/her chances of high academic achievement, a positive self-image, and cultural security when a second language is introduced. The native language should be used as the principal medium of instruction throughout the early childhood and school years, and culturally appropriate content, materials and methods should be used. The second language can then be progressively introduced from around age 7-8 years until it becomes the more widely used language of instruction, but the native language continues to play a major role in the school and the community. Generally speaking, at least 5-6 years are needed to achieve mastery of both languages.

These programmes are advantageous not only to indigeous children but also to other children as well because knowledge of another culture can be enriching. Children who have successfully experienced bilingual programmes can read and communicate in two languages. There is strong evidence that when their bilingualism is valued and regarded positively, these children often surpass the cognitive, creative, and academic achievements of monolingual children, i.e. bilingualism does not impede the aquisition of academic skills, but may enhance them. (Benton,1977, 1988; Cummins, 1981).

4. Culturally Appropriate Early Childhood Education.

The importance of early childhood education to the social and educational development of young children is well recognised in most societies. It is especially beneficial for those children with any sort of disadvantage, for example, most indigenous minority children (because of poverty, poor health and nutrition, racism, and cultural alienation). To be effective the early childhood centre curriculum needs to be compatible with the child's family culture. If this is not so children have to cope with a strange and sometimes hostile environment. Programs need to foster and respect indigenous culture, the values, attitudes, rituals and other practices, special use of environments, and the knowledge and experiences children bring with them to the programs. Teachers, parents and the wider community should be involved in the planning and management.

To be culturally appropriate a programme must adopt learning processes which optimise learning within that culture. Indigenous educational philosophies of practice may not be recognisable from an alternative cultural perspective.[6] Western thought is often closed by the assumption that it is intellectually superior. This leads to descriptions of indigenous thought as "pre-logical" or "pre-philosophical" or "non-

abstract." It is assumed that there are no Maori maths, or Aboriginal science, or Navajo theory of cognitive development. What each indigenous culture does have is its own ontology, epistemology and rationality to which other people may not have easy access. It cannot be assumed that so-called universal theories and the practice based upon them, e.g. a Piagetian theory of cognitive development or an Eriksonian theory of social and emotional development, are appropriate, or should be, or can be used to support a program or to attempt to understand indigenous children's development. Alternative processes of learning need to be acknowledged, respected and validated.

5. Native American Early Childhood Education in the United States.

Native Americans have been colonised by the Spanish, the English, the Dutch and the French over the last 500 years. In 1763, after years of warfare between the European colonial powers, and considerable disruption and suffering to the Indians, the British outlined a plan for permanent Indian territory, and recognised Indian sovereignty. This more liberal policy also maintained Indian allies against the other colonial powers. By 1783 the British were defeated and the Indian allies(including the Iroquois Confederacy) moved to Canada. Meanwhile, in California, the Spanish had subdued the natives and taken some of them into the missions. The new United States signed many treaties forcing Indians to cede already seized lands. During the C19th the states expanded across the continent and Indians were forcably driven west and confined in reservations on unproductive lands not wanted by white settlers. Many died on the journey, e.g. The Trail of Tears. From a population estimated to be around 2.4 million at the time of first contacts with Europeans, the population of American Indians decreased to 250,000 in the 1890s. By 1980 it had risen to 1.4 million. Half now live in cities.

There are 283 tribes in mainland US (Wilson,1986), and about 200 Inuit, Aleut and Indian communities in Alaska. At one time in mainland US, there were thought to be as many as a thousand languages, but attempts to classify them in recent times have identified only 221. Many languages are flourishing with more than a thousand speakers, but many others are not being maintained or are on the verge of disappearing (Miller, 1972).

In the US the state education departments are responsible for the education of children from the age of 5 when they begin school in the kindergarten grade. Pre-school children's programs are licenced and regulated by different authorities - health, social services, special offices, sometimes federal, sometimes by the state. Until the 1960s the educational policies for Native Americans were assimilationist.

In 1965 the federal Project Head Start was set up to provide a total package of care and education to enhance disadvantaged children's social competence. Even so, the program serves only about 20% of the eligible 3-5 year olds (Hymes, 1968). Only 4% of the children in the programmes are American Indians, whereas the majority are Hispanics who make up 22% of Head Start children. Most Head Start programs are attached to schools.

In 1967 the US Congress amended the education act to provide for bilingual education programmes in state public schools. In 1989 a bill passed by the Senate, but stalled by Congress, was to have legitimised American Indian cultures and languages and supported the rights of the people to practice, promote, use and develop their languages, and have them recognised for academic credits in schools and universities (NCAI News, 1989).

The University of New Mexico at Albuquerque has been acknowledged as a leader in research and teaching in bilingual education, particularly with the Navajo people[7] (Spolsky 1982). However, for ECE, Courtney Cazden and Wayne Holm report (personal communication) that there is no evidence of kohanga reo type pre-schools in the US.

Non-governmental organisations such as the American Indian Movement (AIM) point out that many teachers are untrained, or in very basic level training. A shortage of bilingual teachers has led to many monolingual Anglo teachers working with bilingual Navajo aides. There is also a scarcity of appropriate curriculum materials and limited opportunities for teacher training.

In the programmes I observed in the Pueblos, and the Navajo, Mountain Ute and the Lakota Sioux reservations, I found programmes which were not supportive of the indigenous culture. In practice, programmes were transitional to English and Anglo-American culture and had culturally inappropriate measures of assessment[8] (Holmes, 1989). Although these programs claim to actively support native cultures and languages, in practice the attitudes and behaviour of the majority of teachers I observed (both Anglo and Native American), the inadequate provision of resources, and the structural and financial constraints imposed by Head-Start, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) ensured that these programs remained assimilationist.

6. Australian Aboriginal Early Childhood Education.

In 1788 the British began colonising Australia and displacing and alienating Aborigines from their tribal homelands. A pre-European discovery population of about 1.5 million Aboriginal people (Suter,1988) with over 500 different languages were established throughout the whole continent for over 30,000 years. There were many different Aboriginal peoples living sophisticated lifestyles in a variety of environments. The white invasion turned their Dreamtime into a genocidal nightmare. European diseases, violent disputes over land and its resourses reduced the population to 30,000 by the 1930s.

Since then the population has increased to 220,000 (in1986). Aboriginals make up only 1% of the Australian population. Many Aboriginal people now live in cities or on mission stations and in communities set up by white Australian churches and government agencies. Over the last few years increasing numbers have returned to their ancestral homelands and dreaming sites (the "outstation" movement).

No treaties were ever made, because Aboriginals were believed to be, and treated as, sub-human, as animals. The continent was defined as empty and therefore there were no impediments to its colonisation. It was not until 1967 that Aboriginals become Australian citizens and gained the franchise. In 1987 the Prime Minister, Bob Hawke, called for a "compact of understanding" and a treaty by 1990. The treaty is now to become a "Reconciliation" by the year 2000.

In the Northern Territory (NT) of Australia 25% of the total population is Aboriginal. 16% of these are regular speakers of Aboriginal languages. (15% of all Aboriginal peoples live in NT, 25% in Queensland, 25% in NSW, 17% in WA, and 7% in SA). The NT Department of Education is responsible for pre-schools (children age 3-5) which are formally attached to schools. Childcare programs are administered by the Dept of Community Development.[9] The 1970s Whitlam government decided that, wherever appropriate, education should begin in the indigenous language of the children, and that children should be taught by teachers from their own communities. Because there were not enough trained Aboriginal teachers, trained itinerant white teachers were to advise and support resident Aboriginal teacher aides.

Significant developments in Aboriginal pre-schools were reported in the early 1980s (McConnochie, 1982). There was "an emphasis on consolidation of the child's first language, encouragement of strong cultural identity, increasing emphasis on traditional patterns of communication and adult-child interaction, and an increasing use of culturally and geographically appropriate teaching and learning styles"(p127).

Aboriginal staff were involved in planning and implementation. There was "a move away from spatial, temporal and authority structures of the western pre-schools towards a form of pre-schooling more consistent with Aboriginal culture and ideals." But there were also shortages of trained staff, inappropriate school buildings and administrative structures, and a frustration that Aboriginal initiatives were terminated by inappropriate white solutions.

National Policy Guidelines for Early Childhood Education were developed between 1985 and 1988 to provide for the development of appropriate early childhood programs. This, together with the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Policy (1989) should begin to remove some of the remaining obstacles to Aboriginal decision-making and control.[10] The language situation is critical with many languages near extinction with less than 100 speakers (Gale, 1991).

From my visits to state and independent pre-schools and childcare centres with native language programs catering for Aboriginal children in the NT (in Alice Springs, Barunga (Katherine district) and at Batchelor) I have serious concerns that practice appears to be falling far short of the policy guidelines. Decision making and control were still firmly in white Australian hands, and a white Australian curriculum, was evident even though the programs were conducted using native languages. In some centres 5 different Aboriginal languages were in use at the same time. Nevertheless, there are still shortages of trained Aboriginal teachers and inappropriate school buildings (Holmes, 1992).

7. Maori Early Childhood Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

In 1840 the Maori people signed a Treaty with the British. This Treaty was similar to documents signed between the British and other native peoples, e.g. the Cherokee in Georgia and N Carolina in the US in 1763. Subsequently the British and then the NZ Government systematically legislated against, and, when compliance was not forthcomong, has waged war on the Maori people in order to alienate them first from their land and then from their culture. Most Maori are now without land or other resources. Unlike the Cherokee, the Maori have never successfully challenged the NZ government to honour the native version of the Treaty.

In the first 20 years after the Treaty was signed European introduced diseases, to which Maori had no natural immunity, killed 75% of the 250,000 native population. At this point the European population overtook the Maori population and the settlers seized their opportunity to take control in creating the first NZ Government with white male franchise. Legislation has disadvantaged the social and economic position of

Maori since that time. From a population of about 46,000 at the end of the Land Wars in the1870s the Maori population has grown to over 500,000, about 15% of the total NZ population.

The high percentage of New Zealanders with British or other European origins has resulted in a strongly monocultural society. This hegemony is now being progressively undermined to produce a greater awareness of bicultural and multi-cultural issues and the current significance of the Treaty. In education Maori want a bicultural system which will honour the Treaty and give them the right to negotiate with all other tauiwi or immigrant groups who have arrived since the signing of the Treaty for policy and implementation of a multicultural education system.

In New Zealand the Ministry of Education is responsible, together with other state education agencies, for early childhood services, which includes childcare, and school education.

A 1961 policy for integration (described in Simon 1986) replaced the long-standing policy of assimilation. In 1967 the policy concepts shifted from "cultural deprivation" and the child as "problem," to "cultural difference" where the school and education system assumed partial responsibility for the failure of Maori students at school. In 1974 the policy became one of a celebration of "cultural diversity" - a multicultural policy.

The rise of Maori political activism during the 1970s and a greater awareness of Treaty issues amongst non-Maori led to the development of bicultural policies. Maori language and culture were to be included in the curriculum at all stages. Taha Maori, the Maori perspective, introduced in 1984, was to be integrated across the curriculum. In practice, it became just another element trapped within the curriculum. All these policies have failed to meet Maori needs. Maori disenchantment with them has led to the demand for autonomous control over their own educational development.

In practice, there was no special provision for Maori education in state schools (there were some private secondary colleges) before1977. Since that time a small number of model bilingual primary schools (11) and bilingual units and classes in primary schools (around 100) have been set up. In the 1980s independent Maori early childhood and primary schools (Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa) were established, which are now government funded.

The Kohanga Reo/Maori early childhood language nest, a grass roots or whanau movement, was established in 1982 with help from the Department of Maori Affairs

but largely built independently of government support. Both the kohanga and the kura have a Maori educational philosophy and curriculum and the medium is Maori language. Since 1982 over 700 kohanga reo have been established by Maori communities and nearly 10,000 children currently attend.[11] Most of these children move on to primary schools which have little or no provision for continuing their education in Maori.[12] Less than 5% of Maori children (Benton 1988) attend schools in which Maori has the same status as English.[13]

8.Conclusion:
Power, Self-determination, and Culturally Appropriate ECE Programmes.

The so-called 'problems" of minority students are the result of institutionalised racism, ethnicism, classism and linguicism and not just educators' lack of sensitivity to students' needs. The power structures in these societes are a fundamental causal factor in educational failure (Cummins, J, and T Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988). Real progress to meet the educational needs of indigenous peoples is possible by providing for indigenous control of their own educational resources.[14] Educational initiatives, e.g. the move from "assimilation" to "self-management," have been constrained and undermined by successive governments and their agents. Independent movements, e.g. the Australian independent Aboriginal schools and the Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa in Aotearoa/NZ, have challenged the dominant culture to deliver culturally appropriate educational programs to meet the needs of indigenous children.

Beyond the need for indigenous control of decision-making and programme development, there are many difficulties in implementing culturally appropriate programmes for indigenous peoples. For example, the small size of many of the language groups, the dilemma of which language or languages to use in the programme, how the language is to written down, or, indeed, if it is to be written down at all, inadequate teacher education resources, inadequate print resources, little if any media air time, the extent of parent and community support, and continuing resistance from policy makers, politicians and the public.[15]

Government support for indigenous people's education was initiated during a more liberal, democratic, or social democratic period than we are now living under. Legislation passed by current New-Right governments is likely to further disadvantage indigenous movements.[16] Early childhood curricula have generally developed free from government interference in the past. Up to now early childhood centres have retained autonomy over their curricula. Policies for the introduction of standardised testing of even the youngest children place early childhood curricula in a vulnerable

position. Curricula may become driven by governments in an attempt to satisfy the business community's demand for educational programmes that will lead to the reproduction of a compliant workforce. There is a danger that early childhood could end up with a narrowly defined curriculum and "a tool of conservative politics."[17] Then what hope would there be for a culturally appropriate early childhood curriculum for minority indigenous peoples?

Bibliography.

Batchelor College. School of Education Studies. Feb 1991. Reaccreditation Document for the Assoc Dip Teaching (Aboriginal Schools) and the Dip Teaching.

Benton, R. 1977. Is Bilingualism a handicap? Set 77 n1 NZCER,Wellington, NZ.

Chief Seattle. 1982. Who owns the Land? Tu Tangata. 8 Oct/Nov1982

Cummins, J. 1981. Bilingualism and Minority language Children. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) Toronto.

Cummins, J. 1982. Mother-tongue Maintainance for Minority Language Children: Some common misconceptions. OISE Press, Toronto.

Cummins, J. and T Skutnabb-Kangas,1988. Minority Education. Multilingual Matters.

Dept of Employment, Education and Training(Australia). Oct 1989. National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Policy. Aus Govt Pub Service.

Dept of Employment, Education and Training (Australia),1989 Report of the Aboriginal Education Policy Task Force. Aust Govt Pub Service.

Friere, P. 1974. Education: The Practice of Freedom. Writers and Readers Pub Co-op. London.

Gale, M A. 1991. A Review of Bilingual Education in Aboriginal Australia. Australian Review of Applied Linguistics. v 13. no 1.

Graham, B. Feb1981,Starting where they are: Rethinking Aboriginal Early Childhood Education. The Aboriginal Child at School.

Harris, S. May 1991The Changing Face of Aboriginal Bilingual Education in the Northern Territory: A 1990 Update. The Aboriginal Child at School. v 19. no 2.

Holmes, J. 1984. Bilingual Education. VUW English Langage Inst. Occasional Publication no 11.

Holmes, T 1989. Indigeneous Bilingual Early Childhood Programmes in Wales and the US. Report to the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust. Wellington, New Zealand.

Holmes, T , 1992. Australian Aboriginal Language Early Childhiood Education Programmes. Report to the Australia-New Zealand Foundation, Wellington, NZ.

Hymes, J L.1988. ECE:The Year in Review. National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC).

John, V. and V. M. Horner,1971. Early Childhood Bilingual Education. Modern Language Assoc. of America.

McConnochie, K R, and A Russell,1982. Early Childhood Services for Aboriginal Children. Australian Govt. Publishing Service.

McConvell, P. 1991. Australian Aboriginal Studies. no 1.

Metge, J. 1980. In He Huarahi. Report of the National Advisory Committee on Maori Education, (NACME) Dept of Educ.

Mills, J. 1982. Bilingual Education in Australian Schools. Australian Educational Review 18. Australian Council for Educational Research.

Miller, W R, 1972, Language in American Indian Education, BIA, Albuquerque, NM, and Univ. of Utah, (ED 075067)

Ministry of Education(NZ),1988, Te Kohanga Reo Review.

Ministry of Education(NZ),1988, Before Five: Early Childhood Care and Education in New Zealand, NZ Govt Printer.

Ministry of Education(NZ),1991, Draft National Curriculum of New Zealand-a Discussion Document.

National Congress of American Indian (NCAI)News, 1989, v 54, no 7

National Aboriginal Education Committee,1989, National Policy Guidelines for Early Childhood Education, Canberra, Aust Govt Pub Service.

Ochiltree, G, Nov1990, Aboriginal Child Poverty, in Family Matters, J of Aust Inst of Family Studies, n 27, p28-29.

Salmond, A, 1985, Maori Epistemologies, in Overing, J, (ed), Reason and Morality, Tavistock, London.

Simon, J. 1984, Good Intentions, but..., National Education NZEI, v 66, no. 4

Simon, J. A. 1986, Ideology in the Schooling of Maori Children, Delta Research Monograph 7, Massey University, NZ

Spolsky, B.1982, Sociolinguistics of literacy, TESOL Quarterly, v 16

Stewart, I, March1991, Aboriginal Teacher Education in the Northern Territory, Access,v 5, n1.

Stewart, I, May1991, The Cultural Context of Early Childhood Education: Cultural Identity, the Transmission of Packages, and the Process of Westernization. Paper presented at the 10th Annual Northern Territory Children's Services Conference-Environments for Children, Jabiru, NT.

Suter, K, and K Stearman,1988, Aboriginal Australians, Minority Rights Group, Report No 35, London.

Te Tatai Hono,1982, Report on Maori Education, NZEI

Teasdale, G R, and A J Whitelaw,1981, Early Childhood Education of Aboriginal Australians, Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER).

The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, Sept 1985, Aboriginal Education, House of Representatives Select Committee on Aboriginal Education, Canberra, Aust Govt Pub Service, p 35.

Watts, B H, 1982, Aboriginal Futures, (ERDC) Report No 33, Aus Govt. Pub Service.

The Royal Commission on Social Policy,1988, The Treaty of Waitangi and Social Policy.

Wilson, J. 1980, The Original Americans: US Indians, Report no 31, The Minority Rights Group, London.

Zigler, E. F. and C. C. Raver,1991, Three Steps forward, Two Steps Back: Head-Start and the Measurement of Social Competance, Young Children, v 46 n 4, (May 1991)

[1] The Maori whakatauki or proverb in the title of my paper-"Toi te kupu, Toi te Mana, Toi te Whenua"- is an encouragement to all indigenous peoples. Literally "Hold fast to the language, hold fast to the authority, hold fast to the land," I have interpreted this as, "In order to exercise control over your human and material resources, you must hold on to your language, your identity and your political authority.

Early Childhood Education(ECE) programmes are defined as those serving children from birth to 8 years, although in practice the focus is often on the 0-5 age. In some countries childcare is not included in ECE (e.g. Australia)

[2] I am using three criteria to define "indigenous"- to have indigenous ancestry, to identify as an indigenous person, and to be accepted by an indigenous community. This concept of "indigenous" has been developed to further the legitimacy of the peoples' claims for recognition and resources on nation states. It is a politically contested category as well as a descriptive term.

[3] Why these changes are now being accommodated by those in power is also an important question. What purpose, or advantage, does a western capitalist government gain from giving back land and material resources, and assisting the development of indigenous peoples? This question is not considered in this paper.

[4] These names are widely acceptable amongst the people I visited, although Black Australian, and American Indian are also in use. However, individuals and communities often wish to be referred to by their clan, or tribal names.

[5] Many indigenous people's have a special relationship with the land they and their ancesters come from. They see themselves as the guardians of their land and its resources.This can be compared to the western theological concept of "ground of being" -an intimate relationship of people to their essential nature. In practice, many western nations have abused and wasted their land and the lands of many colonised indigenous peoples. The western concept of "freedom" to exploit resources and to buy and sell commodities in the marketplace appears strange to indigenous peoples who do not claim ownership of parts of the natural world but guardianship of the whole.

[6] e.g. what may at first appear to be rote learning instruction of Maori language may be a much more sophisticated teaching method when analysed and understood within the cultural context. It is too easy to trivialise a rich form of learning if the relationship between the learning and the cultural aims and objectives are not understood. The importance of formal and public speaking (whakapapa and mihimihi) the building of self-esteem (mana) and traditionally to the memorisation of genealogical and historical records within a oral culture (whaka papa) necessitates teaching methods qualitatively different from those used within mainstream dominant educational programmes.

[7] Navajo bilingual programs for school age children (e.g. at Rock Point School) have demonstrated the potential of bilingual education (Spolsky, 1982).

[8] For example, at the Navajo Head-Starts I visited children were assessed using the Head-Start Measures Battery-a series of narrowly focused tests oriented towards "school learning" and administered by requiring the children to sit for long testing periods. As has been described by Zigler and Raver (1991), those children who have been successful in these tests have been those who had been given curricula which matched the tests. This "teaching to the test" is bad enough within one culture but when standardised tests are applied cross-culturally there can be no "right" answers for the children to succeed. I was shown tests for Navajo children which used "The Three Bears" and "Little Red Riding Hood" in the language section. Other tests involved perception, maths, science and family and social networks. None appeared to make any concessions to the native culture. Concern over these and similar measures involving the mis-use and cultural inappropriateness of these types of standardised tests has also been expressed by the National Association for the Education of Young Children and the National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Depts of Education (Hymes 1986).

[9] ECE programs are separate from Childcare programs for the purposes of funding and administration in Australia. Pre-school education has traditionally been funded by state governments and Childcare by the Commonwealth or federal government.

10 The nature of Aboriginal ECE programmes is increasingly being determined by Aboriginal people. Batchelor College, NT, is developing an EC course for "remote area", "tradition oriented" Aboriginal communities in partnership with those communities.

11 This compares with the 70-80,000 children in all other early childhood services. About 20% of New Zealand children of pre-school age are Maori. It is clear from these crude figures that even the present rate of attendance of Maori children is below that for others.

12 NZ Ministry of Education recently evaluated Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa. In 1990 there were 9 620 children under 5 in 700 Kohanga with about 2000 graduating to junior primary school each year. Only 253 were able to attend the 11 Kura Kaupapa/schools with a Maori philosophy and curriculum.

13 Te Kohanga Reo Review (NZ Ministry of Education,Sept 1988) reported that "there is widespread dissatisfaction with schools' inability to provide for the continuation of the kaupapa (i.e.the programme of teaching in Maori language and within a culturally appropriate environment), and lack of value accorded the Maori langauge and culture."

14 e.g because Maori and the NZ government are unable to agree on the rights conferred in the Treaty of Waitangi they are unable to agree on the fair allocation of educational and other resources. Maori claim that in 1840 they had agreed to a partnership with a British minority which retained Maori sovereignty and possession of their resources/taonga. Since that time Pakeha (New Zealanders of British descent) have become the majority and have used their democratic power and force of law to alienate Maori from their language, their culture, and their land.

15 Some language groups are small. Some Aboriginal groups have only 100 speakers of their language. and some schools offer several first language programs. This creates logistical and economic problems.
Choice of language. Is the dominant language in a multilingual community acceptable as the school language?
Orthography. How is a language to be represented in written form?
Teacher education. Each programme needs staff trained from their community or from the same language group
Specialist Print Resources and Media Air Time are needed.
Parent/Community support for the language. Many parents do not speak their native language and therefore find it difficult to support their children's language learning.
Resistance from policy makers, politicians and the public, continue to constrain and undermine indigenous initiatives.

16 The latest draft curriculum document from the NZ Ministry of Education (MoE, 1991) no longer refers to the Treaty of Waitangi or to partnership. The Charter Treaty requirement has now been removed, and, although many centres and schools are still honouring their charter, this move has made it easy for others to abandon the Treaty. Schools are now expected to "provide" for Maori language teaching but gone is the committment to integrate tikanga Maori/cultural knowledge across the curriculum. The curriculum itself is about to be revised to accommodate a science/technology bias which will ease the introduction of standardised testing and which at the same time further marginalises the arts and the teaching of Maori language and culture. This will certainly adversely affect bicultural goals and programmes.

17 Michael Apple (a US professor of education) on a visit to NZ warned about this trend in 1983. In the US the Head-Start Measures Batteries are already in use.